

Practitioner's Docket No.

PATENT

		IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE									
	In re application of: JIANG et al. Application No.: 10 / 657,610 Group No.: 1754 Filed: September 8, 2003 Examiner: For: "Monolith Based Catalytic Partial Oxidation Process for Syngas Production										
	Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450										
		STATUS INQUIRY									
	1	WARININ	G: Submission of a status letter after in patent term adjustment under 111–112, June 26, 2001.	r a Notice of Allowance may subect an application to a reduction 37 C.F.R. § 1.704(c)(10). See Notice of may 29, 2001, 1247 OG							
	1.	More	than $\underline{17}$ months have p	assed since							
			NEW APPLICATIONS								
			the filing of this application	on							
			No communication has bee indicating action on this app	n received from the Patent and Trademark Office blication.							
			AMENDED APPLICATIONS								
			the filing of a response on .	•							
			No further communication hoffice.	as been received from the Patent and Trademark							
			APPEALED APPLICATION	•							
	The Appeal Brief was filed on										
			(When using Express Mail, the	ER 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.8(a) and 1.10* a Express Mall label number is mandatory; il certification is optional.)							
	4 he	ereby cer	tify that, on the date shown below, t	this correspondence is being:							
				MAILING							
	X	deposite Box 145	d with the United States Postal Servi 0, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450	ce in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O.							
	ren.	andale as #	37 C.F.R. § 1.8(a)	37 C.F.R. § 1.10 *							
	W	with suff	icient postage as first class mail.	☐ as "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" Mailing Label No							
			Ti	RANSMISSION							

Date: March 4, 2005 Betty Lee (type or print name of person certifying)

Signature

☐ facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office, (703)

^{*} Only the date of filing (§ 1.6) will be the date used in a patent term adjustment calculation, although the date on any certificate of mailing or transmission under § 1.8 continues to be taken into account in determining timeliness. See § 1.703(f). Consider "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" (§ 1.10) or facsimile transmission (§ 1.6(d)) for the reply to be accorded the earliest possible filing date for patent term adjustment calculations.

(check and complete	applicable	items belo	W
---------------------	------------	------------	---

☐ An Examiner's Answer was mailed on
☐ A Reply to the Examiner's Answer was submitted on
ALLOWED APPLICATIONS
the mailing of FORM POL-327 and/or Examiner's Amendment on

Kindly advise the undersigned of the present status of this application, by checking the appropriate box below. A stamped return-addressed envelope is provided.

NOTE: M.P.E.P. § 203.08 Status Inquiries, 8th Edition, cautions as to the submission of status inquiries as follows:

"NEW APPLICATION

"Current examining procedures now provide for the routine mailing from the Technology Centers (TCs) of Form PTOL-37 in every case of allowance of an application. Thus, the mailing of a form PTOL-37 in addition to a formal Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) in all allowed applications would seem to obviate the need for status inquiries even as a precautionary measure where the applicant may believe his or her new application may have been passed to issue on the first examination. However, as an exception, a status inquiry would be appropriate where a Notice of Allowance is not received within three months from receipt of form PTOL-37.

"Current examining procedures also aim to minimize the spread in dates among the various examiner dockets of each art unit and TC with respect to actions on new applications. Accordingly, the dates of the "oldest new applications" appearing in the Official Gazette are fairly reliable guides as to the expected time frames of when the examiners reach the applications or action.

"Therefore, it should be rarely necessary to query the status of a new application.

"AMENDED APPLICATIONS

"Amended applications are expected to be taken up by the examiner and an action completed within two months of the date the examiner receives the application. Accordingly, a status inquiry is not in order after reply by the attorney until 5 or 6 months have elapsed with no response from the Office. A postcard receipt for replies to Office actions, adequately and specifically identifying the papers filed, will be considered prima facie proof of receipt of such papers. Where such proof indicates the timely filing of a reply, the submission of a copy of the postcard with a copy of the reply will ordinarily obviate the need for a petition to revive. Proof of receipt of a timely reply to a final action will obviate the need for a petition to revive only if the reply was in compliance with 37 CFR 1.113."

DATE: MARCH 4, 2005

Reg. No.: 34,942

Tel. No.: (908) 771-6402

Customer No.: 020411 **URE OF PRACTITIONER**

Philip H. Von Neida

(type or print name of practitioner)

The BOC Group, Inc

Legal Services-Intellectual Property

P.O. Address 575 Mountain Ave.

Murray Hill, NJ 07974

STATUS INQUIRY REPLY

APPLIC	AIIC	ON SERIAL NO. 0 / IS CURRENTLY
	AS	SIGNED TO GROUP AND AWAITS:
		ACTION BY THE EXAMINER.
		APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO THE OFFICE ACTION MAILED
•		

APPEAL	NC).
	IS A	AWAITING ACTION BY THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFER-
	EN	CES
		DATE OF HEARING EXPECTED
		DECISION EXPECTED